



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,108	11/27/2006	Rakesh Taori	PI16378-US2	9649
27045	7590	12/27/2010	EXAMINER	
ERICSSON INC.			ELAHEE, MD S	
6300 LEGACY DRIVE				
M/S EVR 1-C-11			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PLANO, TX 75024			2614	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		12/27/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kara.coffman@ericsson.com
jennifer.hardin@ericsson.com
melissa.rhea@ericsson.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/550,108	Applicant(s) TAORI ET AL.
	Examiner MD S. ELAHEE	Art Unit 2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ~~03~~ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 September 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC-9/10)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/19/2005,01/10/2007</u>	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on January 23, 2006 was filed after the mailing date of the IDS on January 19, 2006. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

2. The drawings 1, 2, and 5 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show a legend describing the labels on the Figures as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any

portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities: regarding claim 29, the phrase “in accordance with any of the previous claims” in lines 6-7 should apparently be “in accordance with any of the claims 1-28”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-8, 12-37 and 41-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ala-Laurila (U.S. Patent No. 6,246,871).

Regarding claims 1 and 30, with respect to Figures 1, 2, Ala-Laurila teaches a multi media messaging system in a communications network, arranged for sending and receiving messages between at least one sender and at least one intended receiver, said system comprising:
at least one storage facility, arranged for storing at least one message (abstract; col.1, line 65-col.2, line 11, col.3, lines 1-12);

Ala-Laurila further teaches a controlling arrangement, adapted for controlling storage of a message and for controlling access to a stored message (abstract; col.1, line 65-col.2, line 15, col.3, lines 1-30);

Ala-Laurila further teaches an accessing arrangement, arranged for providing access to a stored message (col.2, lines 12-23, col.3, lines 13-30); and

Ala-Laurila further teaches an alerting arrangement, arranged for providing an intended receiver with an alert relating to the storage of a message, characterized in that, said controlling arrangement is arranged for storing and accessing a message under control of the sender of said message (col.2, lines 12-23, col.3, lines 13-30, col.4, lines 16-64).

Regarding claims 2 and 31, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that each storage facility is assigned to said sender of a message, and wherein said sender selects a storage facility for storing a message (col.3, lines 13-30).

Regarding claims 3 and 32, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that said controlling arrangement comprises means arranged for manipulating a stored message by a sender, said manipulation including at least one of reading, editing and removing a message stored under the control of said sender (col.3, lines 13-30, col.4, lines 9-15).

Regarding claims 4 and 33, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that said alerting arrangement is arranged for controlling said alert by said sender of a message (col.2, lines 12-23, col.3, lines 13-30, col.4, lines 16-64).

Regarding claims 5 and 34, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 4 and 30, teaches that said alerting arrangement comprises means arranged for manipulating an alert, said manipulation including at least one of reading, editing and removing an alert under the control of said sender (col.4, lines 9-15).

Regarding claims 6 and 35, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that said controlling arrangement is arranged for including additional information with a stored message (col.2, lines 12-23, col.3, lines 13-30, col.4, lines 16-64).

Regarding claims 7 and 36, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that said alerting arrangement is arranged for including additional information with an alert (col.2, lines 12-23, col.3, lines 13-30, col.4, lines 16-64).

Regarding claims 8 and 37, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 6 and 35, teaches that said additional information comprises one of the group including: a message identifier, at least one identification key for identifying at least one intended receiver, a telephone number, a URL, a message identifier, a subject, a personal identification number for access authorization and verification purposes, urgency of the message, validity or expiration time of the message, type of alert including a call attempt and a multimedia message, number of alerts, location of the storage facility of the message, key dates, message status and flags that will trigger transfer of notifiers of status changes to the sender (col.2, lines 12-23, col.3, lines 13-30, col.4, lines 16-64).

Regarding claim 12, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claim 1, teaches that said controlling arrangement is accessible by means of an interface, including a graphical user interface, a voice control interface, an interactive voice response interface and a Dual-Tone Multi-Frequency interface (col.2, lines 45-67).

Regarding claim 13, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claim 1, teaches that said alerting arrangement is accessible by means of an interface, including a graphical user interface, a voice control interface, an interactive voice response interface and a Dual-Tone Multi-Frequency interface (col.2, lines 45-67).

Regarding claims 14 and 41, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that said controlling arrangement comprises validating means, arranged for verification and authorization of a subscriber to the communications network attempting to access a stored message, for establishing whether said subscriber is the intended receiver of said message, before granting access to said message by said subscriber (col.3, lines 13-30, col.4, lines 16-46).

Regarding claims 15 and 42, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 14 and 41, teaches that said validating means are arranged for verification and authorization of said subscriber using said additional information (col.3, lines 13-30, col.4, lines 16-46).

Regarding claims 16 and 43, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that said alerting arrangement is arranged for including in said alert information as how to access a stored message (col.3, lines 13-30, 61-67, col.4, lines 1-46).

Regarding claims 17 and 44, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that said controlling arrangement is arranged for storing and accessing a message under control of the intended receiver of said message (col.3, lines 13-30, 61-67, col.4, lines 1-46).

Regarding claims 18 and 45, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that said alerting arrangement is arranged for controlling said alert by said intended receiver (col.3, lines 1-30, 61-67, col.4, lines 1-46).

Regarding claims 19 and 46, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 17 and 44, teaches that the extent of said control is defined by said sender (col.3, lines 1-30, 61-67, col.4, lines 1-46).

Regarding claims 20 and 47, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that said accessing arrangement is arranged for providing access to an intended receiver of a message under access conditions defined by said sender of said message (col.3, lines 1-30, 61-67, col.4, lines 1-46).

Regarding claim 21, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claim 1, teaches that said accessing arrangement is accessible by means of an interface, including a graphical user interface, a voice

control interface, an interactive voice response interface and a Dual-Tone Multi-Frequency interface (col.2, lines 45-67).

Regarding claim 22, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claim 1, teaches that said storage facility is distributed over said communications network (fig.1).

Regarding claims 23 and 48, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches sending and receiving messages including voice mail messages, short messages, email messages and video mail (col.2, lines 45-67).

Regarding claims 24 and 49, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches providing alerts in message form, including voice mail messages, short messages, email messages and video mail (col.2, lines 45-67).

Regarding claims 25 and 50, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, teaches that said alert takes the shape of a form for processing and displaying by a graphic user interface, said form comprising information of at one least message for said intended receiver (col.2, lines 45-67, col.3, lines 1-30, 61-67, col.4, lines 1-46).

Regarding claim 26, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claim 25, teaches that said graphic user interface is arranged for duplex transfer of data, and wherein said form is an interactive form (col.3, lines 1-30).

Regarding claim 27, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claim 1, teaches that said communications network comprises at least one of group comprised by telecommunications and data networks9 including the Internet, a Public Switched Telephone Network, an Integrated Services Digital network, and a Public Land Mobile Network (fig.1).

Regarding claim 28, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claim 1, teaches a terminal including control means arranged for interfacing with at least one of said controlling, alerting and accessing arrangements (col.3, lines 1-30, 61-67, col.4, lines 1-46).

Regarding claim 29, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claim 1, teaches that a network node arrangement for use in a communications network, said network node arrangement comprises a controlling arrangement, arranged for controlling storage of a message and for controlling access to a stored message; an accessing arrangement, arranged for providing access to a stored message, and an alerting arrangement, arranged for providing an intended receiver with an alert relating to the storage of a message (col.3, lines 1-30, 61-67, col.4, lines 1-46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 9, 11, 38 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Eason et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,999,566).

Regarding claims 9 and 38, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, does not specifically teach notifying a sender of a stored message of changes in a status of said message. Eason teaches notifying a sender of a stored message of changes in a status of said message (fig.7, item 710). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila to incorporate the feature of notifying a sender of a stored message of changes in a status of said message in Ala-Laurila's invention as taught by Eason. The motivation for the modification is to do so in order to inform the sender whether his message is received by a particular recipient.

Regarding claims 11 and 40, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 9 and 38, teaches that said status comprises one of the group including "sent", "not read", "read", "expired", "reminded" and "settled" (col.4, lines 9-15).

8. Claims 10 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ala-Laurila in view of Horvitz (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0254998).

Regarding claims 10 and 39, Ala-Laurila, as applied to claims 1 and 30, does not specifically teach notifying a sender of an alert of changes in a status of said alert. Horvitz teaches notifying a sender of an alert of changes in a status of said alert (fig.8; page 9, paragraphs 0103-0104). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ala-Laurila to incorporate the feature of notifying a sender of an alert of changes in a status of said alert in Ala-Laurila's invention as taught by Horvitz. The motivation for the modification is to do so in order to inform the user whether his alert is deleted or not.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to o whose telephone number is (571)272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, FAN TSANG can be reached on (571)272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/MD S ELAHEE/
MD SHAFIU ALAM ELAHEE
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2614
December 20, 2010